

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 have been examined. Claims 1, 7, 9-11 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claims 2-6, 8 and 12-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,671,345 to Lhotak (“Lhotak”).**

Claims 1, 7, 9-11 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lhotak.

**A. Claim 1**

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim 1 recites that print data which can be printed by a printing device is obtained, and is spooled into a predetermined memory. The spooled print data is then converted into display data of a predetermined structure and displayed on a displaying device.

The Examiner maintains that the above features are disclosed by Lhotak. In particular, the Examiner cites to col. 3, lines 11-16, for teaching the conversion of spooled print data into display data. The cited portion discloses that intermediate low level object data of a first format, is reconstructed to an object oriented display list of a second format. Based on the disclosure, it appears that the intermediate low level object data goes through a type of conversion into the object oriented display list (i.e. alleged display data). However, contrary to the recitations of claim 1, the reference fails to teach that the intermediate low level object data is “print data” that can be printed on a printing device. Rather, the reference merely discloses that the intermediate

low level object data is intercepted from a first graphics management tool's interpreter software (col. 3, lines 10-12). Such data does not appear to be ready for printing on a printing device.

Claim 1 further recites that the display data is edited, and the edited display data is inversely converted into a structure of the spooled print data.

As noted above, Lhotak discloses that the intermediate low level object data is reconstructed into an object oriented display list (col. 3, lines 10-14). The object display list is then accessed and processed by imaging software (col. 5, lines 18-22). After processing, Lhotak discloses that the object display list is converted into pixel data suitable for driving a display device (col. 5, lines 22-25). However, such "conversion" converts the edited object display list into a new "type" of data, i.e. data suitable for driving a display device. Therefore, even if Applicant assumes *arguendo* that the intermediate low level object data discloses the claimed print data, and the object oriented display list discloses the claimed display data, the reference still fails to teach or suggest every feature recited in claim 1. For example, contrary to the recitations of claim 1, the object display list (i.e. alleged display data) is not "inversely converted" back to a structure of the intermediate low level object data (i.e. alleged print data). Rather, as set forth above and shown in Fig. 2 of Lhotak, the object display list is converted to a new type of data, i.e. a low level "digital" data 27 for driving the display device 28. Thus, there is no "inverse" conversion disclosed by the Lhotak reference.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

**B. Claims 7, 10 and 17**

Since claims 7, 10 and 17 contain features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

**C. Claims 9 and 11**

Since claims 9 and 11 are dependent upon claims 7 and 10, respectively, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lhotak in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,622 to Takeda ("Takeda").**

Claims 2-6, 8 and 12-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lhotak in view of Takeda.

**A. Claims 2-6**

Since claims 2-6 are dependent upon claim 1, and since Takeda does not cure the deficient teachings of Lhotak with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**B. Claim 8**

Since claim 8 is dependent upon claim 7, and since Takeda does not cure the deficient teachings of Lhotak with respect to independent claim 7, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**C. Claims 12-16**


Since claims 12-16 are dependent upon claim 10, and since Takeda does not cure the deficient teachings of Lhotak with respect to independent claim 10, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino  
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 25, 2004